

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                         | FILING DATE                     | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| 09/400,346                              | 09/20/1999                      | KENTARO TOYAMA       | MCS-058-99          | 3337            |
| 27662                                   | 7590 09/09/2004                 |                      | EXAM                | INER            |
| LYON & HA                               |                                 |                      | LE, BRIAN Q         |                 |
| 300 ESPLANA<br>OXNARD, C.               | ADE DRIVE, SUITE 800<br>A 93036 |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER    |
| 011111111111111111111111111111111111111 | ,                               |                      | 2623                |                 |

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## **Advisory Action**

| Application No. | Applicant(s)  |  |
|-----------------|---------------|--|
| 09/400,346      | TOYAMA ET AL. |  |
| Examiner        | Art Unit      |  |
| Brian Q Le      | 2623          |  |
| Examiner        | Art Unit      |  |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 30 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

| PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]   |
|--|
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.  |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).   |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.   |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:  |
| (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);   |
| (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);   |
| (c) \( \square\) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  |
| <ul><li>(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</li><li>NOTE:</li></ul>  |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):  |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  |
| 5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .  |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.   |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.   |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:   |
| Claim(s) allowed:  |
| Claim(s) objected to:  |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-20,93 and 94</u> .   |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:   |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.   |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)  |
| 10. Other:   |
|  |

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Please refer back to the Final Office Action for the explanation regarding the limitation "a prediction module that provides predictions for a value of each of the plurality of pixels". In addition, the Applicant argues (on page 8) there is motivation to combine Wakitani to Sambonsugi. Wakitani clearly indicates by providing the prediction values for pixels would able to predict the motion values of each pixel and use them for motion mapping to predict the motion of the tracking object in the image sequence (column 14, lines 13-40). If the Applicant feel that his invention is different from the Wakitani teaching, then the Applicant must clearly (specific language) show the differences such as different ways (equation/algorithm/formula) for obtaining predictions of pixel's value. For other arguments, please refer back to the Final Office Action and the explanation above since the rest of the arguments are the same argument regarding the teaching of "prediction module that provides predictions for a value of each of the plurality of pixels". Regarding claim 93 which rejected under 35 U.S.C 112, first paragraph has been overcome.

SAMIR AHMED PRIMARY EXAMINER